UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,585	03/29/2004	Jeffrey A. Aaron	BELL-0340/00379 C1	2073
	7590 04/21/200 L SIBLEY & SAJOVE	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3742	28	PATEL, NIRAV B		
RALEIGH, NC 27627			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/811,585 AARON ET		
Examiner	Art Unit	
NIRAV PATEL	2135	

	NIRAV PATEL	2135	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED 20 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid aband t, or other evidence, wh with 37 CFR 41.31; or	nich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE (f).	g date of the final rejectior FIRST REPLY WAS FILI	i. ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	stension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriat nally set in the final Office	e extension fee action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was appeared.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NO¯ow);	ΓE below);	
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li></ul>	tter form for appear by materially rec	adding of simplifying the	e 155ues 101
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (P	TOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> .		I be entered and an ex	olanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>29,31-35 and 43-52</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowanc	e because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/KIMYEN VU/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135			

Continuation of 3: The amended claims 45-52 are not entered. Even if the amendment to claims 45-52 is entered, the amended claims have not overcome 35 U.S.C. 101 issue. From the specification page 14, lines 20-26 it states "....the computer-readable medium is not limited to devices such as storage device 310. For example, the computer-readable medium may include a floppy disk, a flexible disk, hard disk, magnetic tape, or any other magnetic medium, a CD-ROM, any other optical medium, punch cards, paper tape, any other physical medium with patterns of holes, a RAM, a PROM, an EPROM, a FLASH-EPROM, any other memory chip or cartridge, a carrier wave embodied in an electrical, electromagnetic, infrared, or optical signal, or any other medium from which a computer can read...". Based on the cited disclosure above, it is determined that the computer readable medium carrying a signal (carrier wave) recites a non-statutory matter. Therefore, claims 45-52 are rejected under 35 USC 101.

Continuation of 11 does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 03/20/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding to applicant's argument to claims 29-52, Examiner maintains, since Aucsmith discloses that the server propagates any possible security problems seen by any of the client terminals to all of the client terminal so that all of the client terminals can defend against that possible security problem in real time. The server also uses the possible security problems reported by agent to help detect intrusion patterns, new intrusion techniques, and other security problems that may not be apparent to an individual client terminal (i.e. determining a second device that is anticipated to be affected by the anomaly .......following the detection of the anomaly and prior to detecting at the second device). Therefore, Aucsmith teaches the timing relationship as argued/claimed. Further, Sheikh's invention relates to the monitoring of computer network system for security purposes, wherein the master transport located on a center server provides for the polling of one or more agent transports (serially or parallel), which are located throughout network. The central server evaluates the report received from the agent transport. Thus, Sheikh teaches the polling mechanism in the networked computer system to obtain the report/result. In this case, the combination of Aucsmith and Sheikh teaches the claimed subject matter and the combination is sufficient to incorporate the teaching of Sheikh into the teaching of Aucsmith to utilize the polling mechanism for inspecting network traffic and identifying any anomalies or suspicious activity. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to monitor the computer network system, for security purpose, that requires minimal resistance and maximum flexibility to scalability [Sheikh, paragraph 0003, 0009].

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.